

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

John Ray Dowdle, aka John R. Dowdle,        )  
    ) C/A No. 6:10-0821-MBS  
Plaintiff,    )  
    )  
    )  
    )        **O R D E R**  
vs.    )  
    )  
    )  
Sheriff Bill Blanton; Chief Joel Hill;        )  
Lt. Kenny Brown; Capt. Harold Crocker;      )  
Sgt. Blackwell; Sgt. Spencer; Sgt. Parker;    )  
Sgt. Rhinehart; Sgt. Holly; Cpl. Luna;        )  
Cpl. Polk; Cpl. Price; Cpl. Huggins;        )  
Cpt. Ms. Blackwell; Pt. Padgett; Pt. Bishop; )  
Pt. Dennis; Pt. Queen; Pt. Phillips;        )  
Pt. Hyatt; Pt. Smith; Pt. Bolin;              )  
Pt. Henderson; Pt. Watts; Pt. Lemmonds;    )  
Pt. Kennedy; Pt. Vinsett; Pt. Estes;        )  
Pt. Manning; Pt. Jennings; Pt. Whisnast;    )  
Pt. Bridges; Pt. Green; Pt. Wicks;        )  
Pt. Wiebusch; Pt. Blanton,                    )  
    )  
    )  
Defendants.    )  
----- )

Plaintiff John Ray Dowdle is a pretrial detainee at the Cherokee County Detention Center in Gaffney, South Carolina. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on April 2, 2010, alleging that his constitutional rights had been violated in various respects.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe for pretrial handling. The Magistrate Judge reviewed the complaint pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996. On April 30, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended that the complaint be dismissed because, among other things, Plaintiff's claims are duplicative of claims raised by Plaintiff in two other cases currently

pending in this court. See Dowdle v. Crocker, C/A No. 6:10-31-MBS-WMC; Dowdle v. Blanton, C/A No. 6:10-390-MBS-WMC. Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The court has carefully reviewed the record and adopts the Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff’s complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The court further notes, as did the Magistrate Judge, that Plaintiff has filed numerous actions in the last several months, some of which contain identical claims. Plaintiff is cautioned that his continued filing of claims that are frivolous, malicious, or fail to state a claim on which relief may be granted could result in the imposition of a “strike” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour  
United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina  
May 28, 2010.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

**Plaintiff is hereby notified of the right to appeal this order  
pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.**